

Appl. No. 10/828,910  
Amdt. dated April 4, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 22, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated February 22, 2006, which: 1) objects to the specification due to informalities; 2) objects to claim 3 because of antecedent basis issues; 3) rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite; 4) rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Harwer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,440,755, hereinafter "*Harwer*"), in view of Chan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,446,170, hereinafter "*Chan*") and further in view of Zatorski (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0023803, hereinafter "*Zatorski*"); 5) rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Harwer in view of Chan and Zatorski and further in view of Intel Corporation (hereinafter "*Intel*"); 6) rejects claims 11, 12, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Harwer*; 7) rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Harwer* in view of *Intel*; and 8) effectively allows claims 4 and 7-10.

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, 13, 14, and 17. Therefore, claims 1-20 remain pending. Based on these amendments and the remarks that follow, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration.

#### I. CLAIMS 4 AND 7-10

Claims 4 and 7-10 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims. Applicants appreciate the allowance of these claims and have rewritten claims 4 and 7 in independent form accordingly.

#### II. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Specification stands objected to because of a clerical error in ¶[0014]. Applicants appreciate the Examiner alerting Applicants to this clerical error and accordingly amend the Specification to remedy this clerical error as well as another in ¶[0018]. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the Specification.

Appl. No. 10/828,910  
Amdt. dated April 4, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 22, 2006

### III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 3 stands objected to because the term "the bus" lacks antecedent basis. Applicants appreciate the Examiner alerting Applicants to this lack of antecedent basis and amend claim 3 accordingly and request withdrawal of the objection to claim 3.

### IV. SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. With regard to claim 13, the Office Action notes that the phrase "selecting the first and second slots to correspond to the width of the bus" is allegedly indefinite. In response, Applicants hereby amend claim 13 to emphasize that the method includes selecting the first and second slots to correspond to the maximum number of physical lines of the bus.

With respect to claim 14, the Office Action notes that the phrase "sizing the first and second slots larger than the size of the first and second portions" is allegedly indefinite. In response, Applicants hereby amend claim 14 to emphasize that the method of claim 11<sup>1</sup> includes adjusting the first and second slots such that they can physically accommodate more than just the first and second portions. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments rectify any indefiniteness issues that may have existed with respect to claims 13 and 14.

### V. SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15-19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly obvious over *Harwer* in conjunction with at least one additional reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because neither *Harwer* nor any of the other references teach or suggest all of the claim elements. For example, independent claim 1, as amended, requires:

a first slot configured to receive a device, wherein a first portion of the bridge is coupled to the first slot; a second slot configured to receive a device, wherein a second portion of the bridge is coupled to the second

<sup>1</sup> Applicants amend the dependency of claim 14 from being dependent on claim 13 because the previously discussed amendments to claim 13. Accordingly, claim 14 is now dependent on claim 11.

**Appl. No. 10/828,910**  
**Amdt. dated April 4, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of February 22, 2006**

slot; and ... a jumper board in the first slot couples the first portion of the bridge to the second slot while the jumper board does not occupy the second slot (emphasis added).

Assuming, as is suggested by the Office Action, the first slot of claim 1 were present in *Harwer* at Figure 1, item 28, and the second slot of claim 1 were present in *Harwer* at Figure 1, item 30, *Harwer* teaches a jumper board 40 that occupies both item 28 and item 30. Thus, *Harwer's* teachings are directly contradictory to the language of claim 1 (as amended) and cannot render claim 1 obvious. Furthermore, the remainder of the cited art is similarly deficient in this regard and thus claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

Independent claim 11, as amended, requires "inserting a jumper board into the first slot; wherein the jumper board connects the first and second segments of the first slots, thereby routing the first portion of the bus to the second slot while the jumper board does not occupy the second slot" (emphasis added). As mentioned above with regard to claim 1, neither *Harwer* nor the other cited art teach or suggest that the jumper board does not occupy the second slot. In fact, *Harwer* teaches against this. For at least this reason, claim 11 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claim 17, as amended, requires a "means for coupling a portion of the first slot to a portion of the second slot while not occupying the second slot" (emphasis added). Again, *Harwer* fails to teach any means for coupling the first and second slots that does not occupy the second slot, and therefore *Harwer* teaches against the requirements of claim 17, and none of the other cited art teaches or suggests this claim element. Accordingly, claim 17 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Appl. No. 10/828,910  
Amdt. dated April 4, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 22, 2006

## VI. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Robert M. Tuttle  
PTO Reg. No. 54,504  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400